

**Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council
Marine Reserves Working Group Meeting**

February 21, 2001
8:30 A.M. — 5:00 P.M.
Goleta Valley Community Center
5679 Hollister Avenue
Goleta, California

MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Objectives

The objectives of this meeting were to:

- Ratify Language developed at the last meeting regarding Phasing/Sequencing, Fisheries Management Outside Reserves, and Determinants of Reserve Size
- Craft Preliminary Spatial Options for review by the Science Panel, Socio-economic Panel, and Public At Large;
- Designate a time and location for one or more Public Meetings on Preliminary Spatial Options for Marine Reserves

In Attendance:

Mike Eng — Facilitator
John Jostes - Facilitator
Patty Wolf, Co-Chair
Sean Hastings, alternate for Matt
Pickett, Co-Chair
Locky Brown
Marla Daily
Gary Davis
Merrit McCrea, alternate for Bob
Fletcher
Dr. Craig Fusaro
Dale Glantz

Neil Guglielmo
Greg Helms
Mark Helvey
Deborah McArdle
Chris Miller
Tom Raftican
Steve Roberson
Shawn Kelly

DFG Staff — Paul Reilly, John Ugoretz

Public included approx. 25 people

1. Welcome and Introductions

John Jostes, co-facilitator for the meeting, welcomed everyone and introductions were made around the table.

2. Administrative Matters

John Jostes Reviewed the Agenda.

Mike Eng — Stated that by end of day, we hope to have a series of options to go forward to the Science (SP) and Socio-Economic Panels (SEP) for review. These are to be well thought out straw options on which to get feedback from the public, SP, and SEP. These will be used to help us make further refinements to the options. We ll have to push ourselves to stay on schedule.

John Jostes — We need to look at dates and have some planning to do for the public forum in March.

The January meeting summary was approved by the group pending a few typos and some comments by Bob Fletcher that Sean will incorporate.

Sean Hastings — Mentioned the release of a Scientific Consensus statement on marine reserves. This is another important piece of evidence supporting the Science Panels recommendation.

Craig Fusaro — Asked how this is different than what we've heard from the SP? He sees it as essentially the same, substantively.

Sean Hastings — Replied it is very similar, it validates the SP recommendation, and shows that our SP is not out in left field.

John Ugoretz — Noted that the report does emphasize reserve networks.

Craig Fusaro — Stated that the report describes a network as supporting larval transport from one site to another. This is valuable. He was surprised that the consensus statement does not mention reserve size.

John Ugoretz — Stated that at the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) symposium, the unique benefits of NO-take reserves were emphasized, while not negating other types of MPAs.

Sean Hastings — He heard a lot of support for and interest in the Channel Islands process at the AAAS symposium.

3. Review and Discussion of February 15 MRWG Meeting

Steve Roberson — Feels that phasing is way more restrictive than the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) on the state; this language does not respect what the science panel has told us about the cow cod closure area.

Locky Brown — Concerned about the cow cod closure language — believes it gives the impression that closure will be limited to Santa Barbara island, which is not the case.

Tom Raftican — Other fishery management actions/areas should be considered not just the cow cod closure area.

Greg Helms — This makes it sound like all of these types of MPA's will be used, particularly in advance of the mapping we will do. He couldn't support all three at the same time.

Mike Eng — Noted that the group agreed these would be possibilities for consideration, and that we can add some clarifying language to that effect.

Chris Miller — Stated that integration of fisheries management is complex, and this might go along better with the idea of phasing in reserves. In regards to the cow cod closure — we still need to be able to gauge how it is performing as management. We still need a survey and a reserve as a reference point for the closure. This seems to be related to Mike leaving, in that we don't have a common viewpoint on where we stand on this issue.

Steve Roberson — Said that if we are phasing with a core no-take reserve — we're just debating the size of the core zone. Why go down this path? Let's define what the minimum core area is now, otherwise we'll have trouble later on. Contingent phasing will be very difficult to do in the future, and he doesn't even know if it can be done legally.

Craig Fusaro — Wrote a concept piece on phasing. An assurance that the conservation community has asked for is to know what the final size of the reserves will be. Core is perhaps better replaced with Phase 1. Phase 2 is a carrot and a stick. Agencies need to step up with monitoring and enforcement. This allows an opportunity for the consumptive users to buy in to this and softens the blow.

Steve Roberson — Suggested we define core as not less than 20% of the shore areas. Phasing is a concern because he does not expect to stay at this table that long. Who will do this? Also, how can we require the agencies to do something specific in the future?

Mike Eng — Recalled that future work on phasing would fall to a community group that is being suggested. The core common areas were talked about as a focal point to help us move forward, rather than struggling now to reach agreement on the total size.

Steve Roberson — Perhaps this section should be called *Suggestions for Future Negotiations* is a better title than *Underlying Assumptions*

Craig Fusaro — Suggested replacing *core* with *phase 1*

Steve Roberson — The science panel (SP) told us that fish management issues (like cow cod closure) should not affect the size of the reserve recommendation, but this document suggests otherwise. This ignores what the SP told us. He does not feel comfortable telling the state agencies that they must integrate/do things in a certain way.

Craig Fusaro — Noted that the SP has not met, convened, discussed and answered as a group the question of how fisheries management is being considered/integrated.

Sean Hastings — Corrected Craig and said the SP did meet. The document the SP gave the MRWG (questions and answers) did address this and was reviewed by all SP members.

Satie Airame — Added that there is very little suitable cow cod habitat in CINMS, so it does not have a significant affect on the recommendation. SP in recommending size of reserves assumes fisheries are at MSY. The size *range* suggested allows for the fact that some fisheries might not be managed perfectly. It isn't necessary to specify the cow cod closure in the MRWG's underlying assumptions, because there are other closures and management action out there too— maybe be more general.

Mike Eng — Reminded the group to remember that this language was created, albeit fuzzy, as a way to move forward and to allow some flexibility. This does not resolve the issues, but hopefully provides some flexibility to allow the group to move forward.

Greg Helms — Wants to find a tool to bridge the gaps. Cow cod closure area, allowance of hook and line, etc. — these were looked at as possible negotiation tools. If you count the cow cod closure area and make reserves smaller, it might displace more fishing effort into the CINMS. The issue cuts both ways. He didn't want to see the MRWG lock horns on this any more because it was no longer productive to keep talking about this.

Merrit McCrea — Noted that the charter boats look to waters deeper than 120 feet as back up areas when game fish/pelagic are not biting.

Tom Raftican — Stated that if fisheries management had not had failures, we might not be here. We need to consider the improvements being made to fisheries management. An example would be looking to optimum yield, and steps to reduce take below optimum yield. Does not feel the science panel is considering these management approaches. Would hate to see all of us abdicate all of our expertise to the SP. He stated that if you wanted them (the science panel) to design the reserves, then you should not have invited us here.

Patty Wolf — Asked Steve Roberson if he does not feel the language that calls for the state to integrate (the second paragraph) is inappropriate.

Mark Helvey — Suggested changing *must* to *should*

Steve Roberson — Suggested dropping the text from *One example on* in the 1st paragraph.

Sean Hastings — Said that this is ambiguous enough to allow us to move forward with mapping. We will have to be explicit later. For example, *core* either needs to be defined today, or later. The idea here was to get us to mapping. We could spend a lot of time on this, but he advises saving this for later so we can get to mapping today.

Steve Roberson — Said he would be fine for now if we just made his suggested change.

Sean Hastings — Suggested the group send more comments to John Jostes, who will refine the document and bring it back to the group.

Greg Helms — Asked what is the intended use of this document? Do we have to sign on to this?

John Jostes — No, it's just a bridge, not a final product.

Marla Daily — Asked if the phrase Fisheries management, 1st paragraph, last sentence should be dropped.

Mike Eng — Responded that the agreement was already that this would be removed.

Discussion on Mike McGinnis Departure

Sean Hastings — Stated that he spoke to Mike. Mike was very uncomfortable with the process being guided by this kind of ambiguous language.

John Jostes — Added that he didn't think word-smithing this would help Mike at this point. He referred to Mike's email statement. Mike didn't feel the process was representing his underlying interests, nor the SP 30-50% size range recommendation. He added that the ground rules allow for someone to withdraw. At this time Mike feels his concerns are not negotiable. Mike said he wanted the group to think about why he left before he commented. He commented that he brought a broad community interest to the table. He said that he would be open-minded to returning, if his interests could be addressed/met (meaning an explicit recognition of the SP recommendation). Mike indicated he is supportive of the process, despite his withdrawal. He wants it to succeed. He commented that a replacement for him is not necessarily what he would recommend. Mike would like the group to see an empty chair and think about it. John finished by stating that it is important for everyone to read Mike's e-mail and then asked how the group wants to proceed.

Patty Wolf — Also spoke with Mike. Mike didn't feel he could continue in the process, but did express a lot of support for the process. He is very interested in the outcome, wants to stay informed and involved.

Steve Roberson — Many people in the conservation community feel that not getting 30% is selling out, and unacceptable. Mike felt like this. The 30% threshold is causing a problem for some in the conservation community. Mike should be here negotiating this, but it's his decision if he doesn't want to do this.

Deborah McArdle — Percentage targets are important. We asked for the best available scientific advice, and we got it. The numbers give us a gauge for success. This is why the numbers are important. If we do go less than 30%, it is important that the SP tell us what we will and will not protect.

Patty Wolf — Responded yes, but bearing in mind there will still be a fair amount of uncertainty.

Craig Fusaro — Reserves need to be large enough to work — this was a principle concern of the SP. Craig shares that concern. SP members don't want to make a recommendation that will fail. But because of uncertainties and the other goals on the table, we don't know where the reserves will end up (and how big). He is OK with that, but Mike wasn't.

Chris Miller — Added that Mike was concerned about the approach of using habitat quality rather than % size. When Chris shows the SP recommendation to his constituents, it is received as being too narrow because it does not acknowledge fisheries management. He has thought all along that the MRWG would be evaluating the SP advice, not just accepting it. This has never really been on the agenda. Through the phasing process, we can deal with many concerns. The SP panel advice is still not a product — it's a draft, unpublished. The unanswered questions can be addressed through phasing. He suggested this to Mike. A big issue in this is trust. If we are going to base our decision on half of the goals (biodiversity protection), then the fishing community will not come along. We have been pressured the whole time with a time line, but for no good reason. The people that pushed the timeline caused some of the problems that led to Mike's leaving. We need to come clean on how we feel about the SP recommendation that's what Mike wanted.

John Jostes — Asked if there is an action the MRWG wants to take to address Mike's vacant seat.

Steve Roberson — Stated that maybe we should replace that seat to help provide some balance. Mike might not ever come back, and maybe he should not be able to if he misses too many meetings.

Marla Daily — Said she would prefer not to spend a lot of time on this. Mike made it clear he was intransigent on balancing the goals. Would like to see us take no action on this and move on.

Craig Fusaro — Said that the SAC, using an attempt to create balance in the group established the MRWG. The conservation community is now one short. He suggested that the conservation members of the MRWG get together and make a recommendation.

Gary Davis — Disagreed with Craig. He said this is a MRWG-wide issue for us all to address. The whole process is weakened now, and everyone should recognize this. There needs to be consequences to this.

Greg Helms — Said that Mike thought we were burying the SP in a bunch of stuff that was fundamentally at odds with the goals they advised us on. Feel it would be difficult to replace him.

Mike Eng — Noted that the parity of numbers is important (straw polls, etc.), but it is not a majority rules situation. Everyone has veto power over reaching full consensus. Don't feel the decision-making ability of the group has been diminished.

Sean Hastings — Stated that at first, he agreed with Gary that when someone leaves, we couldn't have full consensus. He recalled this being discussed by the group. He Liked Craig's suggestion for bringing that perspective back.

Tom Raftican — Holding the seat vacant is a disservice to the dynamic nature of this process. Suggested we move to appoint a replacement.

Craig Fusaro — The MRWG needs to respect the SAC's role.

Deborah McArdle — There needs to be consequences for leaving the process. What if this happens again?

Gary Davis — Suggested that consensus could be reached, but if we just keep replacing members that walk then the process is weakened.

Patty Wolf — Was concerned about people saying in the end that consensus was not really reached because someone walked.

Sean Hastings — Said that if some walk, maybe they could attach a dissenting opinion to the final recommendation.

Steve Roberson — Said he was changing his mind. A replacement will bog us down. He suggested we leave it empty, and Mike can come back. But he should not be able to submit a dissenting opinion.

John Jostes — Said that the ground rules were specifically designed to not promote minority opinions at the end.

Mike Eng — Said that two issues were on the table: Should MRWG replace Mike? And if so, how?

Craig Fusaro — Restated his suggestion to defer to the conservation community on this.

Greg Helms — Asked to call for a caucus among conservation community members.

Patty Wolf — Stated she doesn't have a strong opinion on replacing a seat or not, but wants to hear from the conservation group, at the same time Gary's comments are appropriate. There needs to be a consequence to withdrawing. We need to be conscious of how this will affect the process.

A short break was taken to allow the conservation members to discuss replacing the empty seat.

Greg Helms — Thanked the MRWG for allowing the conservation group to make the decision. On balance the decision is to not get into replacing seats, Mike's views will be represented through the other members. This group needs to move forward and work together.

Deborah McArdle — Asked if this could be set as a ground rule at this point?

Sean Hastings — Stated that if a perspective is missing we can always add it, if you leave you are making a choice for your constituency.

Mike Eng — Noted that we have to face the fact that the process is diminished, we don't have the same level of consensus or buy in. Mike did not feel that he had the flexibility to reach consensus by altering his view.

Craig Fusaro — Said that Mike's perspective seemed to be science above all else, that perspective is still at the table, we have only lost some of the intensity.

Greg Helms — Recommended that we move forward without using the option to fill the empty chair, filling it would not be consistent with the environmental viewpoint. This is a process issue.

Mike Eng — Asked if there was anyone opposed to moving on without filling the seat?

Bruce Steele — Mike did have an alternate, and asked if that alternate would be allowed to sit?

Gary Davis — Noted that withdrawing is very different than being absent.

Mark Helvey — The MRWG will we still allow Mike to come back.

Neil Guglielmo — The MRWG should tie in to Mike, and let him know that if he doesn't come back now, the chair will remain empty.

Deborah McArdle — Repeated her question of whether this is a precedent?

John Jostes — The MRWG had the option to fill a seat if it felt a viewpoint is not being represented.

Chris Miller — Said that Mike's decision that he couldn't collaborate anymore and this meeting coming so shortly afterward, doesn't give Mike the ability to discuss with his constituency and determine whether he should be in here or not. Mike needs to explain it to his people and decide.

Mike Eng — Noted that it is very difficult to define Mike's constituency. He might not be able to go to a group and ask if his decision is appropriate.

Patty Wolf — It sounds like we are leaving the seat open for Mike's return.

Craig Fusaro — Suggested this is until the next meeting, if he decides to come back he needs to do it now.

Greg Helms — Believes the seat is open, if he wants to come back we should let him.

Steve Roberson — The group should decide whether or not to allow Mike back if he says he wants to come back.

4. Development of Spatial Options for Review by Science Panel, Socio-Economic Panel and Public At Large

John Jostes — Began the process to develop reserve options. There are some process points to decide on, the socioeconomic panel will want ten minutes today to give some information.

Steve Roberson — Suggested not going into small groups.

Greg Helms — seconded.

John Jostes — We really have to get some maps developed to send out by 5:00 p.m. to give to the advisory groups. We can do this zone by zone, island by island, any way. If we can't make significant progress we wait another month.

Gary Davis — Requested some process clarifications: are we making three mid-range options, or two that we will negotiate to the middle on?

Mike Eng — We need to be in agreement on that issue. We might not get through everything by the end of the day. The process discussion should occur.

Sean Hastings — We need to discuss the characterization of the analyzed options as they are now, that might affect how we map.

Craig Fusaro — Noted that we don't need to be in consensus about the options we come up with today.

Sean Hastings — Agreed that this is to be an analysis of a range of options — The MRWG requested an analyses of a variety of options to 1) Get a habitat analysis from the SITES model and 2) Bob and Peter look at it and analyze the potential impacts to user groups that use those areas. This will be a relative analysis, not a total socioeconomic review. We have to emphasize that it is not a total socioeconomic review.

Options reviewed already by the Socio-economic Panel:

- 1) 50% model,
- 2) 2) Mid — range,
- 3) 3) Common — Ground 4/5
- 4) 4) Common Ground 5/5

Sean Hastings - As you can see there is a range in how these things are analyzed. We were careful not to put a % range on habitat or area, but percent are used for the socioeconomic analysis. The socioeconomic values are for potential economic loss, not just area lost.

Bob Leeworthy — The preliminary economic analysis represents what economic activity went on in that space, and assumes it is all lost. It doesn't take into account the fact that people will do different things and alter their behavior. Under the worst case scenario the reported figures would be the maximum potential impact.

Sean Hastings — Noted that potential future benefits are not examined in this socioeconomic model.

Bob Leeworthy — We can speculate on what might happen in the future, this is the first step in the total analysis. Other factors might come in that change the impact, make it more or less.

Tom Raftican — There are certain boats that go to specific points, do we lose the total value of that boat?

Bob Leeworthy — This where the second level of analysis occurs, this is also when the MRWG gives that sort of specific information.

Sean Hastings — Asked if certain users are beneficiaries?

Bob Leeworthy — yes, in the last column you see groups that are potential beneficiaries to closed areas, kayakers, non-consumptive diving, etc. The secondary analysis might tell us if those groups would benefit from an enriched experience in the future. The numbers represent what activity is happening now, not necessarily what the benefit will be.

Mike Eng — Suggested to go through a series of decisions to determine how to map 1) geographically 2) how many options 3) what the range is 4) function as a group or small groups

- 1) What spatial unit do you want to use? Whole area, bioregion, or island by island?

Craig Fusaro — Asked what are the pros and cons to each? Stated he might have a different opinion if he looks at individual islands. Positive side to looking at each island is that you get down to specifics.

Deborah McArdle — Suggested going off one of the common ground maps and working from there, adding to it to reach a good level of protection.

Steve Roberson — Supported looking at the whole sanctuary at once, starting with the common ground.

Greg Helms — Agreed to starting with common ground, but not necessarily looking at the whole sanctuary.

Mike Eng — Stated he didn't think that we could get through the whole Sanctuary, how about bioregion by bioregion?

Craig Fusaro — Do we all have to agree on every scenario?

Gary Davis — Suggested that the goal is to have a range of option that has everyone's preferred options, the extremes are easy to identify, we need to work toward the middle ground. The hard work begins when we have the analyses.

Mike Eng — Are you suggesting working on the whole region as a mapping unit?

Chris Miller — Neil and I worked yesterday, based on the common ground as a start, looked at gaps then added some and then tried to add some additions that might be phased in. He added that after Neil left, one more option was made.

Sean Hastings — Getting specific helped to allow deciding which points and beaches were in and out, moving them one mile either way is important for the analyses. Suggested starting islands by island or by region then move to the whole area. We might not get agreement, but we'll get down to specifics.

Gary Davis — Suggested we start working and not worry about the level of agreement.

Sean Hastings — Noted that we already have the high and low ends. We need to use what we have done to data.

Tom Raftican — A big concern is that we have been looking at this for some time, the consumptive users have bought in to some of that common area, and it shouldn't be the first step. It will be very difficult to get anywhere beyond the common ground and especially beyond it. The agreement that the MRWG makes will be viewed in other arenas. If we use common ground as a jumping off point then it will be difficult to get any agreement. It is important to realize that where you start is very important.

Greg Helms — In order to improve on the five maps from last time and the four today and get to three is okay. Island by island and or region is possibly a good way to do it.

Mike Eng — If we focus on the whole area we might not get there.

Gary Davis — We need to get the whole thing done, we must look at the total area and focus on the area.

Craig Fusaro — Noted that it would be a hard sell to the public if we don't have the full range.

John Jostes — Asked if you take a sanctuary wide approach, and don't get a full range what do you want to do?

Patty Wolf — Responded that we should make that decision when we get there.

John Jostes — Noted that there were currently nine maps.

Mike Eng — Asked if someone would like to make a proposal on where to begin.

Bruce Steele — The problem with going region by region is that it doesn't balance fairly the different groups. If you concentrate too much at one end then you might have trouble.

Mike Eng — Noted that there was a proposal to look at the whole area.

Steve Roberson — We should do that and start with the common ground and see what can happen.

Mike Eng — Asked if anyone was opposed to a sanctuary wide view, and whether we were shooting for a range of three? And what is the size range?

Craig Fusaro — Stated that we should make every effort to narrow the span, the best outcome would be to narrow the scope to what people might be able to accept.

Tom Raftican — Stated that we seriously shouldn't take the common ground as an option off the table.

Merrit McCrea — The charter boat constituency has to be convinced that reserves are needed at all.

Gary Davis — Noted that there is a problem with zero, we've got to go above that in order to get analyses.

Tom Raftican — You must demonstrate that recreational angling has an impact before you take them out of the picture. There are already massive closures in Southern California, plus the way fisheries are managed has changed. Almost two million people go out and fish each year, where's the impact? We are trying to factor into that what agreement exists.

Steve Roberson — Let's begin with a minimum of ten percent?

Group — uggh!

Mike Eng — The MRWG has achieved consensus on a set of goals and a problem statement. One idea would be to develop three options that are designed to achieve the goals, however we might look at one option that favors socio-economics, one might favor fisheries sustainability, one might focus on biodiversity. We should all, as a group, try to come up with options that try to achieve all the goals but might favor one over another.

Mark Helvey — We should come up with options where there is phasing, there isn't phasing, and where fisheries management is considered. We could look at common ground as the instant reserve with others phased in. We shouldn't forget the other dimension.

Mike Eng — We won't know what the analyses of a different scenario without creating one. We could work concurrently to try to get ranges, phases, and others. The limitation is that trying to do everything together as a full group limits the number of possibilities.

Marla Daily — I'd like to see where the fishing representatives got to yesterday.

Greg Helms — Seconded that opinion.

Sean Hastings — Noted that there are two different maps, one that Chris and Neil worked on one that John Ugoretz, and a few others worked on.

Patty Wolf — Noted that the alternative maps could be brought in as additional input.

Mike Eng — Reminded the MRWG that we aren't looking for a finalized set of options.

Greg Helms — We need to work as a full group. On the fly as a whole group might work better than small groups at this point.

Mike Eng — We could try to get together and do it as a group.

Greg Helms — It seems the summed solution is something we can use, and an option to do nothing. We should see what we could get as a group.

John Jostes — We could put Chris' proposal on the table, then put the DFG/Sanctuary's proposal up, then perhaps a third, knowing that we want to accomplish all four things.

Craig Fusaro — Stated that he supported an hour of time with 30 minutes of Chris' and 30 minutes of Sean's/Sanctuary's.

LUNCH

5. Continued Development of Spatial Options

Specific Proposals, Option 1—

Chris Miller — Stated that his main concept is to use the mapping tool to evaluate what the option looks like. Use the common ground as a reference to phasing, with some performance standards — contingency and performance. His group was looking at expansion based on performance and seeing what total percentages we got.

1 — adjusted Gull Island to include Morse point to Arena point, to capture the whole reef. Using local knowledge to accompany what was in the common ground. This would be the next phase after common

ground, after performance standards based on administrative issues (enforcement, monitoring, and support for community oversight/data management). Looked at a reserve on each island, trying to minimize economic impact, with some areas specific to stock replenishment. Trying to get buy-in especially for the fisheries management goal, this would balance the science on top with all three, fisheries, social, and reserve science.

2 — Relative to the Best Ecological Solutions for Tomorrow plan, we tried to minimize the effects of phasing in.

In the time this map has been out, he has already received criticism.

3 — Looked at the total percentage that phased from 8 to 12 %. Added some areas that might raise the percentage, but didn't really care about percentage. Looked for some extra areas that are basically not accomplishing much for habitat, but don't give a lot of good areas up.

The assumptions of the science panel appear to be totally bogus; there won't be larval retention for lobster. Said performance is very important to getting to the larger area. Start with the common ground 5 of 5 then phasing in to a larger area after administrative performance possibly along with biological performance.

Deborah McArdle — Noted that this map lack rocky intertidal habitat in the Oregonian region, how will it show any positive effects there?

Chris Miller — Responded that he could pick out some good habitat and perhaps whole reefs that would have good effect. But we can't impact the guys like drift gillnet and spot prawn. There are at least three good sites in the Oregonian that would have minimal impact. Going to the edge of the sanctuary can't work in all areas.

Greg Helms — Stated he was pretty demoralized because saying from three to six shouldn't have more impact than the nearshore areas. The environmental groups have more concerns of the zero to three miles, so that they could give in on certain points.

Chris Miller — Said that one of the areas is around Carrington Point, Santa Rosa Island and around Prince Island, San Miguel Island.

Merrit McCrea — Noted that the area around San Miguel Island does include an area of rocky intertidal, it is just offshore.

Bruce Steele — The most important area of the entire islands is the area around Prince Island, as a fisherman he can't understand why it isn't there.

John Jostes — Asked if we could send this to the panels?

Chris Miller — Responded no, we haven't sent this to everyone.

Mike Eng — Noted that this doesn't preclude adding to this later.

Sean Hastings — Recommended not sending this forward because Chris said that this might look different if it was drawn based on habitat quality. This shouldn't be viewed as a map to vote on today.

Chris Miller — We tried to minimize area, it doesn't look at meeting any specific goal. Greg mentioned that things might be scaleable. There is a way to look at it based more on the natural order than the squares.

Gary Davis — Stated we should look at some of the other options before we decide anything, build some options then decide what to send forward.

Option 2

Sean Hastings — This group tried to come up with something to build on, so this isn't a complete proposal. We tried to address all of the goals and objectives in this map.

The group started mapping at one end of the Sanctuary and moved to the other, drawing upon the summed solutions map, the fishermen exclusion maps, without a percentage in mind, focussed on good habitat that supports many species.

San Miguel Island

From an enforcement perspective the mapped areas have clear and identifiable boundaries on cardinal directions, and do not include the major anchorages. The group included Castle rock and Prince Island and added a reserve on the south side of San Miguel Islands in order to compare north and south side closures. The ranger stations would facilitate enforcement, education and research these sites.

Santa Rosa Island, looked to North and South sides of the island, left south east open for squid, left Talcot and Bee Rock open because of importance to kelp and urchin harvest. Included part of Johnson s Lee in order to get some of the anchorage, reef and kelp forest monitoring sites, in and out of protected status.

Santa Cruz Island, again North and South side reserve representation, builds on some of the common ground, captures some of Santa Cruz Canyon, considers education and research purposes, and include Fry s Harbor.

Anacapa Island— Leave s the south side open for the half-day and _ day charter boats to fish. A closure on the north side maximizes access to non-consumptive uses, existing facilities, combines some already closed areas, brown pelican area as well as black seabass congregation, and enforcement is there.

We recommend taking the current reserves that are not in this option and reopening or redesignating them.

Santa Barbara Island— we were trying to add the species not accounted for in the cowcod closure, include Sutil Island, and protect sensitive bird nesting areas.

We didn t get full coverage in the Californian zone, if this is the case, we would prefer for it to be dealt with elsewhere.

We didn t discuss phasing beyond starting with something on each island.

Marla Daily — Noted that it did encompass Christie beach, also you spoke about signage, do you intend to put signs on land?

Merrit McCrea — Asked how would you go about enforcing boundaries?

Jorge Gross — DFG enforcement, wants people to be able to look at regulation and look at a chart and understand the regulation. Known points and major latitudes and longitudes are effective, larger and fewer reserves are better than several small reserves.

Mark Helvey — Asked about phasing, would you look at this as a starting point or ending point?

Sean — Responded that the group hadn t really talked it through, but this is more of a whole package, another option might be in addition to this option.

Locky Brown — Said that the only problem with this is the whole North side of Anacapa is closed, the middle island has some important sand habitat that is good for halibut spearing, within reasonable distance of the harbors.

Tom Raftican — Locky s comments are good, for recreational angling there are lots of areas we d have problems with, Cuylers Harbor, North side Santa Rosa Island, Fornees Cove on Santa Cruz Island as well as some other areas. The common ground is a point where we have absolute agreement, but even there we have some anglers who disagree. Anglers feel they are being pushed out. Let s look at limited impact areas, we might agree to areas like this if you allow fishing for pelagic species, and protect the benthic species. We ve given up a lot already.

John Jostes — Asked what is the tradeoff?

Tom Raftican — We went from will there be a marine reserve, to will there be a network. Once you go beyond the common areas you need to have performance standards. By not shutting out the broadest group who uses the area you might get more agreement especially by tying reserves to performance standards.

Cathy DeWet Olson — Asked what is reason to extend reserves out to 6 miles? If it is just to capture area, should we reconsider shoreline? On Anacapa if you leave Middle Island open there might be negative effects, it appears to be an important black seabass spawning area.

Neil Guglielmo — This map looks terrific as an environmental map, there are too many areas that would impact fishing. If they are all no take, not any pelagic take, he could not support it.

Chris Miller — Added that one of the problems is that people are afraid that this map represents something that could happen. We might get the information on how well this will balance the objectives.

Sean Hastings — What we haven't had is a representation of why economically things won't work. We need the knowledge of the details of what will and won't work and the why of it. The details will help us analyze and make informed decisions.

Greg Helms — We should definitely go ahead and craft a third map based on what we've seen.

The MRWG took a short break for a variety of constituencies to caucus

Option 3

This Option was created by a group of audience participants, MRWG members, and others.

Bring San Miguel back to where it was; include the inside of Prince island, and go all the way around Harris Point, South side from Judith Point into Tyler Bight.

Santa Rosa Island - South Point to 3 miles east of it. North Santa Rosa from Brockway to Carrington, don't lose Rhodes reef out one mile.

Santa Cruise Island — south side from Elephant rock out 2 miles past Gull Island to Laguna Canyon. Santa Cruise north side, we added a small reserve area.

Northwest Half of Anacapa out six miles and over a bit.

Santa Barbara Island, quarter slice covering Sutil Island.

John Jostes — Said this might be a fourth option. Now we get to decide what to send forward to get the richest feedback.

Greg Helms — Stated he would like to hear the MRWG comments regarding this map.

Craig Fusaro — The Footprint reserve was to capture the 47-fathom and 153-fathom highspots.

Merrit McCrea — Noted that this is certainly beyond what he was instructed that he should accept.

Mark Helvey — Said he was wondering when it would be proper to start looking at limited use on top of closed areas.

Chris Miller — Said that if the group is comfortable with Carrington Pt., it opens up the potential to look at other options and pick up other types of habitat.

Greg Helms — Let's go to the Sean Map and enlarge the footprint piece to include Smugglers Cove.

Gary Davis — Noted that we do need to look at a very large impact area.

Marla Daily — It might be better to stay towards the center range, so we don't bog down in the extremes.

Sean Hastings — The map is trying to satisfy all of the goals and objectives as well as the science panel recommendation, it is not an extreme example.

Chris Miller — The public came up with a plan at the first mapping session that was a very large spectrum of reserves, but it was phased in three major steps (the best plan).

Mike Eng — Asked if we could put it on the table as another option to put forward for analysis?

Tom Raftican — Said that this doesn't seem to move us forward, if you put a huge option up, he would recommend putting the zero proposal up.

Gary Davis — Noted that this is just one option within the range,

Mike Eng — Stated that we have common ground 5/5, Chris' option of common ground expanded, Sean's option of an ecosystem approach based on goals and objectives, Audience group's (similar to Sean's), does there need to be a fifth option? Perhaps the best SITES model map as the high-end proposal.

Greg Helms — Stated that we now have six maps, at least five of which are different enough to give us some good information. He wondered about the utility of sending that many maps for analysis. We might want to throw one or more out. A total of three maps might be better.

Merrit McCrea — Three is the most we can expect to get results from.

Tom Raftican — What are we getting from the socioeconomic panel?

John Jostes — They will give it a full analysis, tell us how it effects the different groups.

SUGGESTED OPTIONS TO FORWARD:

Common Ground
Chris
Audience
Sean's
BEST
SITES 50%

Gary Davis — Proposed looking at the top and the bottom and two in the middle that are close to each other.

Sean Hastings — Noted that we will get much more detail in the analysis, so while it won't be repetitive, some of the information we have already at our fingertips in the decision support tool.

Greg Helms — One of the things we lost by taking Chris' and BEST's the phasing possibility.

Bruce Steele — Added that one of the conditions in phasing has to be that there is money forthcoming so that this is achievable.

Gary Davis — We are looking for the information on specific spatial arrangements, we can address phasing later.

MRWG Decision — The following reserve maps would be forwarded to the science and socio-economic panels for review: Common Ground 5 of 5, Sean's, Audience, SITES 50%.

6. Next Steps:

John Jostes — We need to think about when to have a public forum and how we make it productive. Should it be facilitated by MRWG?

Greg Helms — Stated that the MRWG facilitated approach seemed to work last time.

Mike Eng — Noted that the most important thing is to give the public an opportunity to understand the proposals and to get very well documented input. In terms of facilitation, if the MRWG members want to do that it is okay, but they must remember what facilitation is.

Craig Fusaro — Stated that beyond taking input it is important to answer questions. For timing we shouldn't go anywhere past two weeks from today.

Deborah McArdle — Asked if it wouldn't be more valuable if the public had the input from the technical panels.

Sean Hastings — Stated that if we do skip a meeting people should try to come in and continue to refine the maps and options.

Mike Eng — Asked if we could use the next meeting as a public workshop meeting where the two panels present their information fully and we get the public input.

Tom Raftican — Stated that if we do that we should run from 12-5 then 6-9. We also really need to get the agenda and location set early.

Audience Comment — Stated that if the maps could be as detailed as possible that would help the public make comment much more easily.

Sean Hastings — Stated that the 50% map is computer generated specifically for ecological purposes, if we could fix it a little it would look more realistic. Also, we need two minutes for Bob and Peter to pass out some very important economic information.

Audience Comment — Asked that any handouts or options are dated.

SOCIO ECONOMIC DATA REVIEW

Bob Leeworthy — Passed out Socio-economic binders to MRWG members. Noted that tabs relate to the table of contents. Each section gives a description of how the information was gathered, as well as a quality assessment.

GT = Greater Than

GE = Greater Than or Equal to

LT = Less Than

19 operations represent 2.58% caught 12.8 million dollars which is over 30% total value

10.5% of the commercial fishing operations account for 70% of the value.

141 operations catch 80% of the value, which are about 20% of the boats

Species Groups — shown on tab 2

Port Distribution — shown on tab 3

Tab Four begins the species tables — squid map

The meeting adjourned.